IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Petri HYYPPA *et al.*	Confirmation No.: 5147
Application No.: 10/083,169	Examiner: Iqbal, Khawar
Filed: February 26, 2002	Group Art Unit: 2617

For: ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the concurrently filed Notice of Appeal.

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

NOKIA Corporation is the real party in interest.

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III.   STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 9, 12, 16 through 25, 30, 32, 36, 40, 42 through 44, and 46 through 58 are pending in this Application. Claim 22 is an original claim; and claims 1, 19, 23, 43, and 46 through 58 have been previously presented. Claims 1, 9, 12, 16 through 25, 30, 32, 36, 40, 42 through 44, and 46 through 58 have been finally rejected in an Office Action dated June 9, 2010.

It is from the final rejection of claims 1, 9, 12, 16 through 25, 30, 32, 36, 40, 42 through 44, and

46 through 58 that this Appeal is taken.

IV.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No Amendment has been submitted subsequent to the issuance of the June 9, 2010 final

Office Action.

V.   SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed inventions enable a user to authorize the automatic insertion of data (e.g.,

billing, shipping, other transaction data, etc.) in data fields (e.g., a name, an address, a credit card

number, a telephone number and a passport number) in a form based on an identification code

associated with the user equipment (e.g., IMSI) or an international mobile equipment identity

(e.g., IMEI). The user equipment verifies internally that the automatic information insertion

procedure is allowed. In particular, the user equipment verifies the automatic information

insertion independently without interacting with an external device, such as a server.

Independent claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A method comprising:

causing, at least in part, reception of at a user equipment of an information entity including

data fields (See, e.g., Specification page 11, line 26 to page 12 , line 3; 4 in FIG. 1);

verifying internally at said user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification

code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at

least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed, the identification code

being a mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment

(See, e.g., Specification page 14, line 20 to page 15, line 2, page 15, line 29 to page 16,

line 2);

when automatic insertion of information is allowed, automatically inserting at the user

equipment information into at least one data field of the information entity based on

information available at the user equipment (See, e.g., Specification page 14, lines 10-18);

and

causing, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with said automatically

inserted information from the user equipment over a wireless interface (See, e.g.,

Specification page 19, lines 8-11),

wherein the user equipment is a mobile phone (See, e.g., Specification page 1, lines 9-17).

Independent claim 23 reads as follows:

23. An apparatus comprising (4 in FIG. 1):

at least one processor (6 in FIG. 1); and

at least one memory including computer program code (7 in FIG. 1),

the at least one memory and the computer program code configured to, with the at least one

processor, cause the apparatus to perform at least the following (See, e.g., Specification

page 7, lines 11-26, page 11, line 16 to page 12 , line 3),

cause, at least in part, reception of an information entity including data fields (See, e.g.,

Specification page 11, line 26 to page 12 , line 3);

verify internally at said apparatus, at least in part on the basis of an identification code

associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least

one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed, the identification code being a

mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment (See,

e.g., Specification page 14, line 20 to page 15, line 2, page 15, line 29 to page 16, line 2);

when automatic insertion of information is allowed, automatically insert at the apparatus

information into at least one of said data fields of the information entity (See, e.g.,

Specification page 14, lines 10-18); and

cause, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with said automatically inserted

information from the apparatus to a co-operative device over a wireless interface (See,

e.g., Specification page 19, lines 8-11),

wherein the apparatus is a mobile phone (See, e.g., Specification page 1, lines 9-17).

Dependent claim 36 reads as follows:

36. A method according to claim 1, wherein the information automatically inserted into the

information entity comprises at least one of:

name;

address;

credit card number;

telephone number; and

passport number (See, e.g., Specification page 11, lines 10-14).

Independent claim 46 reads as follows:

46. A method comprising:

causing, at least in part, reception of at a user equipment of an information entity including

data fields (See, e.g., Specification page 11, line 26 to page 12 , line 3; 4 in FIG. 1);

verifying internally at the user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification code

associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least

one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed, the identification code being a

mobile subscriber identity code assigned by a mobile service operator to a subscriber

during initiation of the user equipment (See, e.g., Specification page 14, line 20 to page

15, line 2, page 15, line 29 to page 16, line 2);

when automatic insertion of information is allowed, automatically inserting at the user

equipment information into at least one data field of the information entity based on

information available at the user equipment (See, e.g., Specification page 14, lines 10-18);

and

causing, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with the automatically inserted

information from the user equipment over a wireless interface (See, e.g., Specification

page 19, lines 8-11),

wherein the user equipment is a mobile phone (See, e.g., Specification page 1, lines 9-17).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTIONS TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. Claims 1, 9, 12, 16, 18 through 25, 30, 32, 36, 37, 40, 42 through 44, 47 through 51, and 53 through 55 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness predicated upon *Breck et al.* (US 20040210449) in view of *Parker* (US 5864757).

B. Claims 46 and 56 through 58 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness predicated upon *Breck et al.* in view of *Capitant et al.* (US 6976011).

C. Claim 52 was finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness predicated upon *Breck et al.* in view of *Parker* and *Lewis* (US 20030105641).

VII.   ARGUMENTS

A.   **THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 9, 12, 16, 18 THROUGH 25, 30, 32, 36, 37, 40, 42 THROUGH 44, 47 THROUGH 51, AND 53 THROUGH 55 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) IS NOT VIABLE BECAUSE NEITHER *BRECK ET AL.* NOR *PARKER* DISCLOSE OR SUGGEST "VERIFYING INTERNALLY AT SAID USER EQUIPMENT, AT LEAST IN PART ON THE BASIS OF AN IDENTIFICATION CODE ASSOCIATED WITH THE USER EQUIPMENT, THAT AUTOMATIC INSERTION OF INFORMATION INTO AT LEAST ONE OF SAID DATA FIELDS OF SAID INFORMATION ENTITY IS ALLOWED**

The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention under any statutory provision always rests upon the Examiner. *In re Mayne*, 104 F.3d 1339, 41 USPQ2d 1451 (Fed .Cir. 1997); *In re Deuel*, 51 F.3d 1552, 34 USPQ2d 1210 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 26 USPQ2d 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner is required to provide a factual basis to support the obviousness conclusion. *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967); *In re Lunsford*, 357 F.2d 385, 148 USPQ 721 (CCPA 1966); *In re Freed*, 425 F.2d 785, 165 USPQ 570 (CCPA 1970).

The filing date of *Breck et al.* is June 10, 2004, 2001, which is subsequent to the effective filing date of the present application, which is March 2, 2001, the filing date of the priority document GB 0105265.3 of this application. The original priority document is in the English language and fully supports the claimed inventions. The parent application No. 09/800,461 of *Breck et al.* was filed on March 7, 2001, which is also subsequent to the effective filing date of

the present application. Therefore, *Breck et al.* and its parent application do not constitute prior art with respect to the claimed inventions.

Out of the three provisional applications of the parent application, the provisional applications 60/200,625 ("'625") filed on 4/28/2000 and 60/187,620 ("'620") filed on 3/7/2000 mention auto-filling of an account number (e.g., page 3 of '625). '625 and '620 merely provide an on-line wallet that has to be browsed online in order to auto-generate and auto-fill a single use account code number in a webpage (p. 3, lines 16-20 & 24-25; FIG. 1 of '625). '625 and '620 involve **an external payment sever** to provide the on-line wallet and auto-filling, after receiving a PIN number and a click of "check out." Since the on-line wallet and auto-filling require an external server, the provisional applications of *Breck et al.* do not "**verify internally at said user equipment**, at least in part on the basis of an identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed."

Even assuming *Breck et al.* constitute prior art, in the embodiment (¶¶ [0077], [0078]) asserted by the Examiner, a smart card reader is used to extract the PIN code from a smart card and then transmits the PIN code to **a card issuer server** for verification (FIGs. 14-15). In this embodiment, regular passwords or pins are used to authorize automatic payment form-filling. Upon entering the PIN, the secondary transaction number (STN) 15 will be generated by **the card provider's** STN transaction system (FIG. 8), or generated directly from the **smart card chip** (¶ [0077]). For safety reasons, smart card PIN codes are not stored in *Breck et al.'s* card reader but elsewhere. The PIN code is not stored in *Breck et al.'s* card reader as the identification code stored in the user terminal. The card provider's STN transaction and the smart card chip are **external** to the card reader. As such, *Breck et al.'s* card reader does not "verify **internally** at said

user equipment that the automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed". In addition, *Breck et al.'s* card reader is not a mobile phone. *Breck et al.'s* smart card/card reader operates independently from any mobile phone.

In the alternative embodiment of *Breck et al.* (¶ [0067]), as asserted by the Examiner, a secondary transaction number (STN) is automatically downloaded from a digital wallet into the payment fields 144, 146, 148 (FIG. 7) on the payment web page 2b (FIG. 7), while the digital wallet may reside locally at the cardholder's computer (¶ [0100]). However, the digital wallet stored in the user terminal was described only in *Breck et al.*, but not in any of the provisional applications. As such, the alternative embodiment of *Breck et al.* does not constitute prior art with respect to the claimed inventions.

As to U.S. Ser. No. 09/652,899 by *Bishop et al.* that was incorporated by reference in *Breck et al.* (¶ [0065]), it was filed Aug. 31, 2000 and issued into US Pat. No. 7,343,351. *Bishop et al.* describe a digital wallet system that requires a wallet server 140 external to a customer computer 110 to pre-fills forms (Abstract; FIG. 1). As such, *Bishop et al.* do not "**verify internally at said user equipment**, at least in part on the basis of an identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed."

In addition, none of the provisional applications of *Breck et al.* mention that the system can be used in association with landline phones, cellular phones, pagers, handheld computers or any other PDA devices as in ¶ [0074] of *Breck et al.* The provisional applications of *Breck et al.* do not provide "a mobile phone" as the user equipment to perform the claim features.

In the final Office Action of June 9, 2010, the Examiner acknowledged that *Breck et al.* do not teach the feature of "the identification code being a mobile equipment identity code

assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment" (e.g., IMEI) as recited in independent claims 1 and 23.

The Examiner asserted that *Parker*, in col. 7, lines 50-65, discloses the above-identified claim feature and then concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to incorporate Parker's **mobile equipment** identity code into the **credit card reader or PC** of *Breck et al.* Appellants disagree. There is simply no logical reason why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Parker's **mobile equipment identity code** into the **credit card reader or PC** of *Breck et al.*

Parker's mobile equipment identity code is used to lock and unlock a mobile phone (Abstract). It cannot be realistically said that one skilled in the art would have had any reason to add *Parker*'s mobile equipment identity code into *Breck et al.* to "verify that the automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed" in a credit card reader or PC.

The Examiner asserted that the motivation to combine *Breck et al.* and *Parker* is to use *Parker*'s IMEI code to provide security. Even if one skilled in the art combined *Breck et al.* and *Parker*, the direct combination is to use *Parker*'s IMEI to lock and unlock *Breck et al's* card reader/PC. Since neither reference teaches or suggests using IMEI to **authorize automatic insertion of information**, the Examiner's assertion of using *Parker*'s IMEI to authorize automatic insertion of information in *Breck et al's* card reader/PC is clearly based upon hindsight reasoning. "Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight." *In re Dembiczak,* 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999). "Not only must the claimed invention as a whole be evaluated, but so also must the

references as a whole, so that their teachings are applied in the context of their significance to a technician at the time--a technician without our knowledge of the solution." *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil,* 774 F.2d 1132, 1143 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Appellants separately argue the patentability of claim 36. the information entry of the provisional applications of *Breck et al.* only include a single use account code number (p. 3, line 19 of '625), but not a name, an address, a credit card number, a telephone number and a passport number.

Based on the foregoing, it is apparent that even if the applied references were combined, and Appellants do not agree that the requisite basis for the asserted motivation has been established, the claimed invention would not result. *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.,* 837 F.2d 1044 (Fed. Cir.1988). Accordingly, the Examiner failed to establish a *prime facie* case of obviousness for lack of the requisite factual basis and want of the requisite motivation to combine the applied references. Appellants therefore submit that the imposed rejection of claims 1, 9, 12, 16, 18 through 25, 30, 32, 36, 37, 40, 42 through 44, 47 through 51, and 53 through 55 U.S.C. §103(a) based on *Breck et al.* in view of *Parker* is not factually or legally viable.

> **B.   THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 46 AND 56 THROUGH 58 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) IS NOT VIABLE BECAUSE NEITHER *BRECK ET AL.* NOR *CAPITANT ET AL.* DISCLOSE OR SUGGEST "VERIFYING INTERNALLY AT SAID USER EQUIPMENT, AT LEAST IN PART ON THE BASIS OF AN IDENTIFICATION CODE ASSOCIATED WITH THE USER EQUIPMENT, THAT AUTOMATIC INSERTION OF INFORMATION INTO AT LEAST ONE OF SAID DATA FIELDS OF SAID INFORMATION ENTITY IS ALLOWED**

Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), particularly the fact that the provisional applications of *Breck et al.* do not disclose the claim features of "verifying internally at said user

equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed." The deficiencies of the provisional applications of *Breck et al.* are not cured by *Capitant et al.* relied upon for the features of "the identification code being a mobile subscriber identity code assigned by a mobile service operator to a subscriber during initiation of the user equipment."

The Examiner asserted that *Capitant et al.*, in col. 5, lines 18-20 and col. 10, lines 16-21, disclose the above-identified claim features and then concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to incorporate *Capitant et al.*'s **mobile subscriber** identity code into the **credit card reader or PC** of *Breck et al.* Appellants disagree. There is simply no logical reason why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine *Capitant et al.*'s **mobile subscriber** identity code into the **credit card reader or PC** of *Breck et al.* One skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine *Breck et al.* and *Capitant et al.* as suggested by the Examiner, since *Breck et al.* require a smart card reader or PC while *Capitant et al.* use a stand-alone mobile phone. *Breck et al.'s* smart card/card reader operates independently from a mobile phone in *Capitant at al.*

Capitant et al.'s IMSI is used to **identify an e-wallet of the buyer** (col. 10, lines 16-22). It cannot be realistically said that one skilled in the art would have had any reason to add *Capitant* et al.'s IMSI into *Breck et al.* to "verify that the automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed" in a credit card reader or PC.

The Examiner asserted that the motivation to combine *Breck et al.* and *Capitant et al.* is to use the IMSI code of *Capitant et al.* to provide security. Even if one skilled in the art combined *Breck et al.* and *Capitant et al.*, the direct combination is to the buyer's IMSI in *Capitant et al.* to

identify *Breck et al's* e-wallet. Since neither reference teaches or suggests using IMSI to **authorize automatic insertion of information,** the Examiner's assertion of using *Capitant et al.*'s IMSI to authorize automatic insertion of information in *Breck et al's* card reader/PC is clearly based upon hindsight reasoning. *In re Dembiczak, supra.*

Based on the foregoing, it is apparent that even if the applied references were combined, and Appellants do not agree that the requisite basis for the asserted motivation has been established, the claimed invention would not result. *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., supra.* Accordingly, the Examiner failed to establish a *prime facie* case of obviousness for lack of the requisite factual basis and want of the requisite motivation to combine the applied references. Appellants therefore submit that the imposed rejection of claims 46 and 56 through 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on *Breck et al.* and *Capitant et al.* is not factually or legally viable.

C. THE REJECTION OF CLAIM 52 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) IS NOT VIABLE BECAUSE *LEWIS* DOES NOT CURE THE DEFICIENCES OF *BRECK ET AL.* AND *PARKER*

Claim 52 depend from independent claim 1. Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), particularly the fact that these references do not disclose the claim features of "verifying internally at said user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed." These deficiencies are not cured by *Lewis*, relied upon for the features of "purchasing a ticket at an entrance," etc.

Appellants therefore submit that the imposed rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on *Breck et al., Parker* and *Lewis* is not factually or legally viable.

VIII. <u>CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF</u>

For the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the Examiner's rejections are in error and, hence, solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections of the appealed claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

<u>September 9, 2010</u>   <u>/Chih-Hsin Teng/</u>
Date   Chih-Hsin Teng
                                          Attorney for Appellant(s)
                                          Reg. No. 63168

                                          Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
                                          Attorney for Appellant(s)
                                          Reg. No. 44658

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 822-7186
Fax (703) 519-9958

IX. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method comprising:

causing, at least in part, reception of at a user equipment of an information entity including

data fields;

verifying internally at said user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification

code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at

least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed, the identification code

being a mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user

equipment;

when automatic insertion of information is allowed, automatically inserting at the user

equipment information into at least one data field of the information entity based on

information available at the user equipment; and

causing, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with said automatically

inserted information from the user equipment over a wireless interface,

wherein the user equipment is a mobile phone.

2. - 8. (Canceled)

9. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein at least part of the information automatically

inserted in the information entity is obtained from a storage unit provided at the user equipment

or from another information entity available for the user equipment.

10. - 11. (Canceled)

12. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the information is automatically inserted by a

transaction processing unit of the user equipment in a predefined manner and in accordance with

predefined instructions that define the information that is to be inserted in the information entity in response to an event.

13. - 15. (Canceled)

16. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said information entity is a standardized data entity.

17. (Canceled)

18. A method as claimed in claim 16, wherein said data entity is based on the Electronic Commerce Modeling Language or an electronic data card format.

19. A method as claimed in claim 18, wherein the electronic data card format comprises an electronic business card.

20. A method as claimed in claim 1, comprising communicating transaction information via an interface that is based on at least one of the following: short message service (SMS); wireless application protocol (WAP); interne protocol (IP); a short range radio link; a proximity card type interface; or an infrared link.

21. A method as claimed in claim 20, comprising receiving the information entity via a first type of interface and returning the information entity via a second type of interface.

22. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the user equipment communicates with a base station of a cellular communication network.

23. An apparatus comprising:

at least one processor; and

at least one memory including computer program code,

the at least one memory and the computer program code configured to, with the at least one

processor, cause the apparatus to perform at least the following,

cause, at least in part, reception of an information entity including data fields;

verify internally at said apparatus, at least in part on the basis of an identification code

associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least

one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed, the identification code being a

mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment;

when automatic insertion of information is allowed, automatically insert at the apparatus

information into at least one of said data fields of the information entity; and

cause, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with said automatically inserted

information from the apparatus to a co-operative device over a wireless interface,

wherein the apparatus is a mobile phone.

24. An apparatus as claimed in claim 23, wherein the apparatus is further caused to store information, and to fetch information from said storage unit and to insert said information from the storage unit into the information entity.

25. An apparatus as claimed in claim 23, wherein the apparatus is further caused to obtain information from at least one other information entity and to insert said information from the at least one other information entity into said information entity that is the subject of the information insertion procedure.

26. - 29. (Canceled)

30. A method according to claim 1, wherein the information entity is a form, and the form is selected from the group consisting of a billing details form and a shipping details form.

31. (Canceled)

32. An apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the information entity is a form.

33. -35. (Canceled)

36. A method according to claim 1, wherein the information automatically inserted into the information entity comprises at least one of:

name;

address;

credit card number;

telephone number; and

passport number.

37. - 39. (Canceled)

40. A method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising enabling the service provider to indicate a selected one of options including acceptance and rejection of the information supplied for inclusion in a form based on a comparison of the identification code to a record of codes.

41. (Canceled)

42. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the information automatically inserted is available internally at the user equipment without accessing an external database external to the user equipment.

43. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the identification code is input when the user equipment is switched on, the automatic insertion of information is kept in an authorized state as along as the user equipment is on.

44. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the information entity is verified every time prior to automatically insertion of the information.

45. (Canceled)

46. A method comprising:

causing, at least in part, reception of at a user equipment of an information entity including data fields;

verifying internally at the user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed, the identification code being a mobile subscriber identity code assigned by a mobile service operator to a subscriber during initiation of the user equipment;

when automatic insertion of information is allowed, automatically inserting at the user equipment information into at least one data field of the information entity based on information available at the user equipment; and

causing, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with the automatically inserted information from the user equipment over a wireless interface,

wherein the user equipment is a mobile phone.

47. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the identification code is input by a user of the user equipment.

48. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the identification code is stored in the user equipment.

49. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the identification code is globally unique.

50. A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the identification code is an international mobile equipment identity (IMEI).

51. A method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising: verifying internally at the user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an input derived from a user, that the automatic insertion of information into at least one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed by the user.

52. A method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising:

purchasing an entrance ticket via the wireless interface from a ticket issuer; and

redeeming the ticket at an entrance gate by using of the user equipment as an authorization device for the entrance gate.

53. A method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising:

detecting that information required in another information entity available in the information entity;

verifying internally at the user equipment that automatic insertion of the required information into at least one of the data fields of the other information entity is allowed; and

when automatic insertion of the required information is allowed, automatically inserting the required information into the at least one data field of the other information entity based on the required information available in the information entity.

54.   A method as claimed in claim 53, wherein the automatic insertion of the required information of the information entity into the other information entity is conditioned upon that the information entities are associated with an identical service provider.

55.   A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the user equipment independently verifies, on the basis of the identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed.

56.   A method as claimed in claim 46, wherein the identification code is globally unique.

57.   A method as claimed in claim 46, wherein and the identification code is an international mobile subscriber identity (IMSI).

58.   A method as claimed in claim 46, wherein the user equipment independently verifies, on the basis of the identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed.

X.   <u>EVIDENCE APPENDIX</u>

Appellants are unaware of any evidence that is required to be submitted in the present Evidence Appendix.

XI.   <u>RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX</u>

Appellants are unaware of any related proceedings that are required to be submitted in the present Related Proceedings Appendix.